R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 734 EA 001 319

THE CHANGING EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS--IMPLICATIONS FOR QUALITY EDUCATION.

BY- DOHERTY, ROBERT E. AND OTHERS
STATE UNIV. OF N.Y., ITHACA

PUB DATE NOV 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.08 50P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, *COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION, ECONOMIC FACTORS, *EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, TEACHER SALARIES, *TEACHER ROLE, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, UNIONS, URBAN SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, COST EFFECTIVENESS, DECISION MAKING, ITHACA,

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS SIX PAPERS PRESENTED AT A CONFERENCE HELD MAY 12-13, 1966, AT THE ROOSEVELT HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS AND THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AT CORNELL. THE PAPERS, REFLECTING SOME ASPECT OF THE CONFERENCE THEME, "THE CHANGING EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS," INCLUDE--(1) CHARLES S. BENSON, "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATED WITH COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS," (2) CHARLES COGEN, "CHANGING PATTERNS OF EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS," (3) ALLAN M. WEST, "A CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIPS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS--IMPLICATIONS FOR QUALITY EDUCATION," (4) MORRIS E. LASKER, "THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION--OBSERVATIONS OF A BOARD NEGOTIATOR," (5) JOAN R. EGNER, "MAJOR THEMES--POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT," AND (6) WILLIAM T. LOWE, "QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY." THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE ON THE CHANGING EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS (NEW YORK, MAY 12-13, 1966) AND IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM DISTRIBUTION CENTER, NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14850, SINGLE COPIES FREE TO NEW YORK STATE RESIDENTS, ADDITIONAL COPIES AND OUT-OF-STATE ORDERS $0.50. (HW)

ED019734

The Changing Employment Relationship in Public Schools

edited by

Robert E. Doherty
Joan R. Egner
and
William T. Lowe

Charles S. Benson
Charles Cogen
Morris E. Lasker
Allan M. West

EA 001 319

A publication of
the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations,
a Contract College of the State University,
Cornell University

1st printing

Single copies of this bulletin will be sent upon request free of charge to residents of New York State. A charge of 50¢ each will be made for all out-of-state orders and for all orders of two or more copies.

Teachers in New York State who wish to use this bulletin in connection with a class or courses are requested to arrange for multiple use of a small number of copies (not more than 15).

Order from the DISTRIBUTION CENTER of this School.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Changing Employment Relationship in Public Schools:

Implications for Quality Education

Edited and Compiled by
ROBERT E. DOHERTY,
JOAN R. EGNER
and
WILLIAM T. LOWE

November 1966

NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK

This conference was held from May 12 to 13, 1966, at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City and was under the auspices of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations and the School of Education at Cornell.

Contents

Introduction
by Robert E. Doherty v

Economic Problems of Education Associated with Collective Negotiations
by Charles S. Benson 1

Changing Patterns of Employment Relations
by Charles Cogen 9

A Change in Employment Relationships in Public Schools — Implications for Quality Education
by Allan M. West 19

The Influence of Teacher Collective Bargaining on the Quality of Education: Observations of a Board Negotiator
by Morris E. Lasker 29

Major Themes: Points of Agreement and Disagreement
by Joan R. Egner 35

Questions for Further Study
by William T. Lowe 39

Introduction

*Robert E. Doherty**

THE SOMEWHAT graceless title we have given the theme of this conference demands some explication. "The Changing Employment Relationship in Public Schools" suggests that growing numbers of public school teachers and school boards are accepting collective bargaining or some similar device as a method of working out the employment arrangement in their respective school systems. By the spring of 1966 perhaps as many as 10 percent of the 1.7 million public school teachers in America were working under elaborate and comprehensive collective agreements. Teachers and boards of education in New York City, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Rochester, Boston, Yonkers, Detroit, and in more than a hundred smaller towns and cities have bilaterally determined such employment conditions as salaries, leaves, teacher transfers, grievance procedures, length of the school day, number and duration of faculty meetings, measures for dealing with obstreperous students, and in some cases, obligations of teachers to attend PTA meetings.

Eight states† have accommodated to these aspirations for a more formal employer-employee arrangement by placing on the statute books legislation that compels school boards to negotiate with teacher organizations if a majority of the teachers in a given school district indicate a desire to do so. In three of these states teachers are covered along with other categories of public employees; in the remaining five — Connecticut, Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, and California — the statutes deal only with certificated public school personnel. There seems no

---

* Associate Professor, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

† Note: California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin.

question that these statutes have spurred a considerable amount of activity. Within six months after the Connecticut statute was adopted, for example, over half of Connecticut's public school teachers had gained formal recognition under the law. Less than a year after the enactment of the Michigan statute, the Michigan Labor Mediation Board had received 560 petitions for representation elections and dozens of agreements had been negotiated. The "change" then is a movement away from those circumstances in which school boards unilaterally determined employment conditions to those in which teachers, acting through their organizations, are taking on the role as equal partners in making these decisions.

The expression "quality education" is more difficult to define. But certainly it means that the schools are staffed with intelligent, imaginative, hard-working, and highly motivated teachers who enjoy decent working conditions. It means also that the schools have adequate instructional facilities and essential supplies of teaching materials. It would be difficult to conceive of a school system providing quality education that did not have bold and imaginative leadership, with its administrators having all the necessary authority to make and enforce decisions affecting curriculum and all other educational matters, including, to a certain extent, personnel policies.

Behind the word "implications" is the assumption that teacher collective bargaining and quality education cannot be considered as completely independent phenomena. They must somehow impinge upon each other. Since the purpose of collective bargaining, after all, is to put employees in a position where they can make meaningful intrusions into the employer's so-called prerogatives and reduce the area of his flexibility, it follows that it should have some impact on the way the schools are run and the kind of education students receive.

The question then is: Does this new relationship, on balance, improve or worsen the quality of the educational enterprise? Does a new salary schedule arrived at through negotiations (which we shall assume is a somewhat different schedule than one a school board would have imposed unilaterally) assist the school system in attracting and retaining the kind of teachers it thinks it needs, or does it merely reflect the economic interest of the majority of the teachers? Do salary increases induced by the collective might of the teachers at the bargaining table come at the expense of other educational endeavors? If they do, is the retention of good teachers, which we assume is one of the consequences of increased salaries, more or less important than the educational serv-

ices that have been curtailed? Are the limitations that a signed agreement places on administrative flexibility -- such as fixing the number and duration of faculty meetings, the right to make transfers, the setting of limits on the working day — are these circumscriptions of managerial authority more than compensated for by the improvement in teacher morale that might result from these limitations? Does a grievance procedure ending with arbitration do no more than create that important sense of security for teachers, or might the process tend to intimidate building principals, causing them to make decisions they might not and should not otherwise have made?

The practice of collective negotiations is so new to public education that even if we had a yardstick to measure educational quality it is probably much too early to make an assessment of how great or what kind of an impact it has had. Yet it is a problem that deeply concerns school administrators whose primary job is to provide the greatest possible educational opportunities for children. Certainly the school administrators present at the conference, representing the school systems of Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, New Haven, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse expressed some anxiety as to just what this development means in terms of their ability to carry out their obligations to the community.

The speakers, as the following papers show quite clearly, took a more sanguine view. The spokesmen for the two major teacher organizations, Charles Cogen and Allen West, were persuaded that teacher collective action was entirely consistent with quality education, indeed, that the second almost automatically followed the first. Obviously, Mr. Cogen and Mr. West were each convinced that *his* organization could do the job best. Having served on a school board and represented school boards in negotiations, Morris Lasker, while expressing some concern about the possibility of collective bargaining being abused for internal political reasons, felt it would be a force for improvement. Charles Benson saw collective bargaining serving, among other things, as a possible vehicle for securing equality in educational opportunity.

Whatever else might be said, it looks as though more and more teachers will soon be working in school systems where employment conditions are bilaterally determined. Since there seems to be at the same time a growing public concern about improving the effectiveness of our schools, we shall all be anxious to see whether the optimism expressed in these four papers is warranted.

Economic Problems of Education Associated with Collective Negotiations

*Charles S. Benson**

THE SUCCESS of teachers' unions in winning bargaining rights in a large number of our major cities, together with the passage in 1965 of negotiation bills in eight states (two of these bills being subsequently vetoed by governors), presage an expansion of "collective negotiations" in American education.[1] This essay seeks to raise some questions about the consequences of this development and about the conditions under which these consequences may be realized.

Necessarily, my discussion of these questions is speculative in nature. (1) Though unions, as distinct from professional associations, now have won the right to represent a substantial proportion of elementary and secondary teachers, the unions possess such bargaining rights in a small percentage of school districts. I am not able to judge which types of districts (rich suburban, working-class suburban, central city, industrial city, etc.) will most handily join the fold from here on, but I feel that the patterns of school district response to recognition elections may well have effects on the outcomes of collective activity. (2) I am not privy to the councils of NEA or AFT leadership; this is an obvious handicap in discussing the topic of this paper. (3) Dynamic growth of collective negotiations is occurring at a time when elementary and secondary education is in a stage of ferment; effects of unionism on the

* Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

[1] The phrase is put forward in the forthcoming volume, *Collective Negotiations by Teachers,* Rand McNally and Company, by Myron Lieberman and Michael Moskow. For a discussion of the present state of collective negotiations, see Charles A. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman, "A Survey of Collective Activity Among Public School Teachers," *Educational Administration Quarterly,* Spring 1966, pp. 133–151.

distribution of education resources cannot be neatly isolated from what the federal government is trying to do, say, about programs for the disadvantaged or about the development of more effective schemes for testing pupils.

With these cautions in mind, I suggest that collective negotiations, whether exercised at the local or state level, will serve to maintain the upward pressure on teachers' salaries. In the postwar period, public school teachers' salaries have advanced at an annual rate of 5 to 7 percent. In some states, elementary and secondary school salaries have now been raised to the point where they compare quite favorably with salaries paid to college and university professors. Naturally, the question has been posed as to how long the pace of advance could be maintained for school teachers' salaries, especially since the practice in public education has been to rely upon extremely informal methods of collective negotiations of pay. Formal collective negotiation is, in my view, the *deus ex machina* to breathe new life into the teacher's struggle to achieve the standard of living enjoyed by the majority of his college classmates.

Second, it appears that collective negotiation is a force working for the revitalization of central city in America. In situations where boards of education are appointed, not elected, and where childbearing couples of high education have already fled the area anyway, a militant teachers' organization may be the only likely group with sufficient political muscle to restore the cities to their former position of leadership in elementary and secondary education. Until this happens, middle-class families cannot return to the cities, no matter how faceless they find the suburbs. On the other hand, it is hard to see why the values of city life should be the prerogative of the very rich, the very poor, or the childless.

Third, it appears that collective negotiation will serve to revitalize the role of the public school teacher in America. Unfortunately, the school teacher's position has fallen to that of a docile, time-serving bureaucrat. It is not the role of a virile professional, intent upon preserving his due measure of autonomy. Collective negotiation establishes a legally sanctioned confrontation of teachers face to face with members of the governing board, and this new practice cannot fail to raise the teacher's professional self-image. The disillusioned teacher is offered an alternative to passive resistance; the dissident teacher is offered an alternative to carping, destructive criticism; and the professionally ambitious teacher is offered a means to influence educational policy without having to leave the classroom and become an administrator. I feel it very likely

that this kind of revitalization of the teacher's role will lead to a large increase in teacher-initiated innovation, not innovation imposed from above and implying a change in structure (team teaching, ungraded primary, and the like) but innovation occurring in the existing instructional situation and dealing with a fairly specific act of learning (teaching mathematics to disadvantaged elementary pupils by the "discovery methods").

These last two yields of collective negotiation can be obtained for public education only if the dynamic changes in the instruction of the young occur within the public education system. This is not a certainty. Private education is expanding and proposals for its further expansion through the use of parents' vouchers (the "Friedman proposal") continue to be made. Similarly, the educational activities funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity are now of an impressive size. It is interesting to note also that the California legislature has just passed a bill under which the investigation of promising educational innovations can be contracted out to private firms and under which the implementation of innovations can be carried out without regard to the Education Code.

For the existing public system to preserve its dominance in the provision of educational services, it is important that it make progress toward two objectives: the reduction of inequalities of school provision and the increase of efficiency. Let us consider mainly the former and its relation to professional organizations.

Whereas the development of systems of tax-supported education in all fifty states, together with the fact that tax-supported schools are now our only major alternative to church-related education, indicates that America has a commitment to equal educational opportunity, any careful observer can readily detect serious lapses from the goal in three forms. First, there are gross differences in educational provision from one school district to another. The favored districts (ordinarily those populated by middle-to-upper income professional classes) are notably better staffed and otherwise supplied with the materials of the trade than are, generally speaking, districts populated by working-class families and minority groups. Second, within large districts there often are found favored schools in one part of the city and "slum schools" in another. Some of the extreme deprivations that characterized the slum school as late as the end of the decade of the '50's have now been corrected, but it is still mostly true that children from the poorest neighborhoods in our large cities attend classes taught by inexperienced

or poorly motivated teachers. Third, secondary school programs in our country display a concentration in quantity and quality of resources on the side of the liberal arts-pure science curriculum, in contrast to relative starvation (including starvation of ideas and leadership) on the side of the applied science-performing arts-visual arts curriculum. The high schools do well for the bookish boy or girl but not so well for the youth who is interested in the wonderfully beautiful and complex physical world he sees about him and who is simply impatient to get on with it, whatever "it" may be in the particular instance. The question I raise, then, is simply this: What effect, if any, is collective negotiation going to have in reducing inequality of educational opportunity? My conclusion, for whatever it is worth, is, not much in the near future; in the longer run, perhaps a great deal.

Let's think first about collective negotiation and the disparities of provision among school districts. These inequalities could conceivably be reduced by action at the local as well as the state level (though I place my bets on the latter). In any case, dealing first with local action and assuming that, when teachers win collective bargaining rights, expenditures in the affected districts advance more rapidly than they would otherwise (which is not, by the way, a very strong assumption), we must admit that we have no evidence that bargaining units will be predominantly successful in districts where expenditure increases are most urgently needed. Indeed, if just the opposite happens — that is, if teachers are especially effective in exercising bargaining rights in what are already high-expenditure places — disparities of provision could be worsened, not improved, by the spread of collective negotiation. But let us recognize further that, even when teachers bargain in poor districts, the thrust that their collectivity of action can provide is blunted, relative to favored districts, by property tax limits and the regressive nature of the local tax structure generally.

What, then, of the possibilities of action at the state level? State legislatures appropriate vast sums of money to assist local authorities to operate schools. In my opinion, they would be willing to vote even larger amounts of money for this purpose if they could attack directly those inequities of provision and finance with which our state school system is riddled and if they could get local school authorities to agree on certain basic objectives, like the objective that, as far as is humanly possible, all normal children be taught to read early in their elementary school years. NEA-affiliated state education associations demand money for local school support but, for the most part, block a direct attack on

educational inequalities (other than what is achieved under mildly "equalizing" forms of state aid) and resist the setting of pupil attainment standards by the state legislature. They do this, of course, under the sacred banner of home rule.

Actually, there is more to it than this. The conventional view is that educational quality and educational expenditure stand in a one-to-one relation. Teachers' associations (NEA) have held that "local competition" for educational resources is the dynamic element in raising the level of school expenditures. The rich suburbs are the districts that engage most eagerly in the competition for teachers' services, etc. Insofar as efforts by state governments to promote greater geographic equality of provision put a checkrein on those rich districts, the goal of reducing inequality is antagonistic to over-all advances in educational quality.

State legislatures might appreciate having a different point of view about the state-local division of powers and duties in education, and AFT groups might well be the ones to bring such proposals in. But votes count. NEA affiliates have large memberships, numerous allies among parent groups, and the money to mobilize these two catchments of votes to seat or unseat particular legislators with fair regularity. AFT groups have a counter to the parental allies of the NEA, namely, organized labor. However, this is not sufficient, I would think. AFT needs votes of its own members if it is to have influence at the state level.

What is the outlook? In the past, I get the feeling it has almost been a matter of pride that an AFT local could represent all teachers in a district while enrolling only a minority of eligible membership. The union position toward dues check-off appears to be weak or ambivalent. The attitude to exclude administrators from membership means that there will be little central office pressure on teachers to join up, which conceivably places AFT in a disadvantageous position as compared with NEA when it was in its major growth phase. If correction of district-by-district inequalities requires action at the state level, it is hard to see that AFT will soon acquire sufficient power to bring about the necessary changes, even if it should be union policy to try to do so.

Now, let's turn to the role of teacher organizations in correcting imbalance of provision among schools within single districts. The extreme problem occurs in large city districts, and it is in these districts that unions hold sway. The visible aspect of the problem appears to be that experienced teachers bid out of service in slum schools. The unions, I understand. have blocked the efforts of central administrations to ameliorate the problem by the simple device of issuing a fiat to delay or

forestall the transfer of teachers from one school to another. The unions, more positively, have insisted that the conditions which drive teachers out of slum schools should be corrected, as far as possible and, further, that the special educational requirements of slum children should be recognized by extra generous allowances of staff, materials, and the like. The best known example of their approach is the "Effective Schools Program" in New York City.[2]

The approach is worthy, noble, and really, of course, the right answer, as long as neighborhood schools and slums exist. It is a costly program, however, and will not amount to much unless the state governments underwrite the cost by making extra grants of school aid to high-density urban areas. If the unions are acting responsibly in this situation, they will find it necessary to make a case for metropolitan school support in the state legislatures. This requires that AFT have votes, and again, I do not see how they can represent an impressive block of votes without having a substantial membership of their own.

It is in correcting the third type of inequality — namely, that which exists among competing secondary school programs — that I feel most optimistic about union action in the short run. If AFT ties to AFL-CIO mean anything, I should think that teachers as a group will become less effete. Teachers' attitudes toward the worth of different kinds of secondary education are influential, I believe, in establishing students' attitudes toward whether it is important to work hard if one is enrolled in any but the college preparatory programs. The "Tentative Summary Report for an Effective Schools Program in Urban Centers" raises the question as to whether there should not be a "curriculum less invested with middle class values and accents, and more respectful of the . . . realities and strengths of our multifaceted population."[3] That such a statement should be made at all is a hopeful sign.

To use education is to continue to learn. Necessarily, formal education involves a certain amount of overtraining, and this is true whether we are thinking of a premedical program or a program in auto mechanics. The reason is simple: it is impossible to predict exactly those things that an individual will need to know when he gets on the job. How can more individuals be encouraged to accept the necessary degree of overtraining that a technologically advanced society exacts as the price of job advancement and job security? I suspect that teachers have more ideas

---

[2] See *American Teacher*, vol. 12, no. 2 (October 1965), p. 5.

[3] Report prepared by the National Council for Effective Schools and published by the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, March 1965; p. 3.

on this point than they have yet put into practice and that, as they acquire through unionism a closer grasp at the local level on the controls of educational policy, they will indeed act to improve educational opportunities for the ordinary student, now languishing in that misbegotten labyrinth internal to the comprehensive high school, called most commonly, I believe, the "general track."

If these observations are anywhere near the mark, we are in an unfortunate position in this country, for we shall continue to suffer from a compounding of underinvestment in the education of certain groups of children. Children from disadvantaged homes enter school with environmental handicaps in learning and, once in school, are offered second-rate programs. Because learning is to some degree sequential or cumulative, the results of these two conditions are multiplicative, not additive. The general goal, nonetheless, was stated well by R. H. Tawney many years ago:

> The idea that differences of educational opportunity among children should depend upon differences of wealth among parents is a barbarity. . . . It is educationally vicious, since to mix companions from homes of different types is an important part of the education of the young. It is socially disastrous, for it does more than any other single cause to perpetuate the division of the nation into classes of which one is almost unintelligible to the other. . . . What a wise parent would desire for his own children, that a nation, insofar as it is wise, must desire for all children. . . . It is to be achieved in school, as it is achieved in the home, by recognizing that there are diversity of gifts, which require for their development diversity of treatment. Its aim will be to do justice to all by providing facilities which are at once various in type and equal in quality.[4]

Last, I would note that efficiency criteria are likely to become of increasing importance in education. There is now in this country a considerable interest in seeing whether cost-effectiveness techniques are applicable to the problem of allocation of school resources. Let us assume that allocation decisions become subject to a greater amount of rigorous analysis. This may affect the process of collective negotiations, I believe, in a particular way. It is possible that cost-effectiveness studies will reveal that teachers who possess highly specialized types of training and who function in specialized roles make contributions to educational outputs that are rather unique. This would suggest that increasing

---

[4] R. H. Tawney, *Equality* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 4th ed., 1952), pp. 157–159.

numbers of teachers with specialized training should be inducted into the school services to work, be it noted, in the classroom. It would also suggest that training and job assignment should play a more significant part in the determination of teacher pay differential than these factors now do. In the past, teachers' organizations have held rather firmly to the notion that the primary determinant should be seniority. It is an open question whether the more formal types of collective negotiations that are now being introduced across the land will aid or hinder those adjustments that are aimed at providing a more flexible salary structure.

Changing Patterns of Employment Relations

*Charles Cogen**

THE GREATEST revolution currently taking place in the public schools of our nation has to do with the changing patterns in employment relations. These are broad and pervasive, with potentially far-reaching effects. The vital question before us is: What effect do these changes have on the quality of education? I have been asked to discuss this problem in relation to the philosophy and programs of the American Federation of Teachers.

It is generally recognized that the great transformation in the framework of employment relations received its initial impulse from the momentous steps taken by our New York City local, the United Federation of Teachers, in 1960–1962. Two dramatic strikes forced upon the local by extreme exigencies, a resounding victory in a collective bargaining election, and the negotiation of a remarkable precedent-setting agreement combined to set the stage for a new era in our schools. The demand for collective bargaining elections swept the land.

Soon, even the NEA and its affiliates, which had opposed the whole concept of collective bargaining as a labor union tactic and unprofessional, were forced into fighting for their own peculiar variant of collective bargaining, namely, professional negotiations. In fact, they have, in some school districts, seen fit to certify that they are unions in order to qualify as contestants in collective bargaining elections.

Collective bargaining, thus, is rapidly replacing the old system of brief *pro forma* hearings and unilateral board decisions by the well-proven procedure of negotiation and bilateral decision-making. The negotiations of the AFT locals' contracts have involved numerous sessions, and management, as well as employees, have had to justify

* President, American Federation of Teachers.

their positions by facts and hard reasoning. This is a far cry from the arbitrary dicta handed down in the traditional school rule-making.

And so, in the process of developing a status of equality across the bargaining table, the AFT has moved from an organization of protest to an organization of power. As Walter Reuther has said, "You can't do anything without power." It is essential to recognize this new teacher ingredient in the public school structure.

The evolving pattern of negotiated rights and duties, while initially it met with great resistance by school administrators, and still does, in varying degrees, has gradually come to be accepted, and even welcomed in some quarters. At any rate, it is being seen as inevitable by more and more people, including school officials. One of the most outstanding spokesmen among superintendents for the recognition of the new pattern of employment relations is Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools in New York City, who speaks from a wealth of experience, both before and after he assumed the superintendency. Speaking at a symposium on "Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," he said:

> Negotiation is here to stay. I think in the long run that if the voice of the teacher is heard — if the voice of the teacher is admitted to the councils of administration — it will be good for the school system. . . .
>
> It is difficult [for the board and superintendents] to yield a little authority. . . .
>
> . . . as the teachers' organizations mature — and maybe as we mature with them — education as we argue it will be more than salaries and working conditions. There are signs now of teachers' organizations willing to take up the other aspects, of recruitment and internship and effective teaching and better schools. That is the hope of the future.[1]

Furthermore, a wise administrator looks upon collective bargaining, not as an imposed burden, but as a boon to a soundly functioning system. The board of education and the superintendent with vision and sound notions of human relations see in the collective bargaining process a means whereby the creative spirit of the teaching staff can be harnessed for the betterment of the school system, and certainly a means for bringing grievances into the open where they are amenable to redress.

---

[1] Bernard E. Donovan, "Speaking for Management," at a symposium on "Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," presented by the Association of School Business Officials, published in *School Management*, November 1965, p. 71.

Consequently, and stemming from the realization of the fruitful results of talking things out, the Board of Education included in the New York City contract a provision — followed later by others — for ongoing consultation. The superintendent is mandated to meet with the union representatives at least once a month to discuss problems of mutual concern. Likewise, every principal is mandated to meet at least once a month to discuss school problems with the union representatives in the school.

This process of ongoing consultation has many advantages. It provides a regular channel for clearing the atmosphere and bringing new ideas to the fore. Furthermore, it offers the opportunity for discussing educational problems — such as teacher recruitment, curriculum, and the difficult schools — which the board of education insists are not working conditions and therefore not negotiable in the collective bargaining process itself.

The Relation to the Philosophy and Programs of the AFT

The new pattern of employment relations in the schools follows logically, and almost inevitably, from the philosophy and programs of our organization. Also, as we shall see later, both of these are well calculated to improve the quality of education that is our national objective.

The slogan of the AFT, and its guiding star, is "Democracy in Education — Education for Democracy." Clearly, collective bargaining is the economic phase of the democratic process. It provides for participation by the governed in the governing process. It is a recognition of the equality of the teacher and the administrator in the realm of decision-making, at least in a wide variety of matters.

As for the particularized goals of a teachers' union, we take for granted the items of higher salaries, smaller classes, academic freedom, tenure, more free time for lesson planning and other non-classroom activities, improved welfare benefits such as sick leave and medical insurance, improved pension systems, extension of sabbatical leaves, and much more. Our philosophy and our programs are interrelated, and, as we shall see in more detail shortly, these are, in turn, closely related to the pattern of employment relations as we see it. Thus, our union philosophy, and our recognition of the often divergent interests of teachers and administrators, give high priority to tenure, whereas the

NEA has in various instances opposed the enactment of tenure laws in order not to alienate the powers that be.[2]

We are, of course, affiliated with the AFL-CIO and are deeply committed to the principles and goals of trade unionism. This involves, procedurally, not only the tactic of collective bargaining, but also the use of a militant stance generally when warranted — strong statements to the administration and publicity, picketing, rallies, and the strike as a last resort in very serious situations.

We are particularly proud of the goals and policies of the AFL-CIO. They include socially beneficial measures on every front — medicare, better housing, attacks on poverty, etc., but in particular, greatly improved education. Indeed, all of these social improvements have an indirect but important effect on the education of a child.

The labor movement has, for more than a century, been in the forefront of the battle for the greater spread and improvement of education. Its role in this direction is an important part of the total picture of quality education that we are considering. The AFT's contribution to that role, directly and through the AFL-CIO, is very much involved in its view of the area of employment relations.

The AFT recognizes that in many areas there is a conflict of interest between teachers and administrators. This does not mean a virtual class struggle; in the general situation we are all working toward the same goals. But the very fact that teacher grievances are widely prevalent, even in the best of systems, indicates conflicts of some sort. And the substantive aspects of collective bargaining reinforce this built-in conflict. For example, the teachers may desire an objective and fair transfer policy, while the administration may prefer complete freedom to transfer or not to transfer. The teachers want a voice in the determination of their programs, while the supervisor may prefer complete freedom of action. The teachers' organization may feel that a teacher has been dismissed or otherwise penalized unjustly. And so on. — All of this leads to the collective bargaining principle that teachers should be in separate bargaining units from supervisors and administrators. (Heads of departments constitute a grey area, since they usually do some teaching.)

It is important to pursue in further depth this principle of conflict of interest. We need to realize its inherent existence in our educational

---

[2] See, for example, N. A. Masters, R. H. Salisbury, and T. H. Eliot, *State Politics and the Public Schools,* 1964, quoted by Michael H. Moskow, "Teachers' Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues," *Teachers College Record,* February 1965, p. 459.

system, its basis, and the consequences that follow from recognizing or refusing to recognize its existence.

First, let me hasten to give the reassurance that the assertion of this conflict does not make one subversive or harmful to the best interests of education. As Professor Jack Barbash observes, there is nothing wrong in employers and employees having essential differences of interests. "There is a good deal of innocent but sometimes malicious mischief inflicted by well-meaning people who say that there are no differences in interests between employer and employee. . . . There is really nothing subversive or immoral about this conflict of interest. In fact, this is the whole theory of our constitutional form of government."[3]

Even Professor Virgil E. Blanke, who is very wary of "the collective bargaining model," recognizes the futility of running away from the conflict thesis. "Most schools," he says, "function now as if professionalism was synonymous with a lack of controversy. . . . Is it not true, however, that all organizations grow through intelligent controversy?"[4]

I go a step further, claiming authority for the statement that conflict of interest between teachers and the administration rises as teachers become more professional. Dr. Ronald G. Corwin, who made an interesting research study of this subject, came to this conclusion. A few quotes are in order: ". . . professionalization is a militant process which contributes to rates of organizational conflict. . . . The proportion active in unions is positively associated with the proportion of the faculty high in professional . . . orientation."[5]

The logic of this correlation between professionalism and conflict arises out of the greater interest of the more professional segment of teachers in improving the school system.

One of the incidental, but significant, points made by Dr. Corwin is bolstered by a research project by Dr. William T. Lowe. He studied a school district in which both NEA and AFT subgroups were employed. He found that "the AFT members indicated a significantly larger interest and membership (in professional associations such as the

---

[3] Jack Barbash, "Union Philosophy and the Professional," *The American Teacher Magazine,* December 1957, p. 7.

[4] Virgil E. Blanke, "Teachers in Search of Power," *The Educational Forum,* January 1966, p. 235.

[5] Ronald G. Corwin, "The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools," Cooperative Research Project No. 1934, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963–1964; quoted from the summary of the final report, pp. 12–15.

American Historical Association and the National Council of Teachers of English) even though many of the groups like the two suggested here have a working relationship with the NEA."[6]

Here, again, we have evidence that unionism and militancy (i.e., conflict) are correlated with professionalism.

Why do I seemingly belabor this point? Only by recognizing the conflict of interest can we come to the urgent realization that classroom teachers must be separate and apart from administrators in their collective bargaining situations. It follows from the previous citations that not only the teacher as an individual, but also the profession as a whole, and the school systems, will benefit from action that is in accord with this policy.

It follows also that the teachers' interest will best be served if they, rather than the administrators, lead and control their organizations. "Since the supervisor has the authority to act in the interest of the employer, there is no assurance, of course, that he will act entirely in the interest of the employees. . . . Maximum benefit for the teacher can only be obtained when leadership of his organization is devoted exclusively to his interest."[7]

The strength of the AFT in the realm of employment relations lies largely in these two facts — that it recognizes the conflict of interest between teachers and administrators, and that it keeps the control of the organization in the hands of the teachers. The NEA, on the other hand, glosses over this conflict and gives control of the organization to administrators, completely so at the national and state levels, and to a substantial degree at the local level.

From the philosophy of the AFT it follows that collective bargaining, properly structured, is the key to the solution of the conflict situation. It is not true, as some contend, that collective bargaining is detrimental to education because it artificially creates conflicts. On the contrary, the conflicts, as we have seen, are there to begin with, and collective bargaining is the *democratic process whereby these conflicts can be resolved.*

Incidentally, it is the domination by administrators that explains why so many of them coerce teachers into belonging to the NEA. It also helps to explain why some NEA affiliates, as stated above, have opposed

---

[6] William T. Lowe, "Who Joins Which Teachers' Groups?" *Teachers College Record,* April 1965, p. 617.

[7] Michael H. Moskow, "Teacher Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues," *Teachers College Record,* February 1965, p. 455.

tenure laws. And it explains why most of the NEA "professional negotiations" have eventuated in valueless agreements.

Effect on the Quality of Education

Some of the effects of the changing patterns in employment relations on education are direct, while others are indirect.

Let us look at the indirect effects first. They may, indeed, be of equal importance with the direct ones.

First and foremost is the lift of teacher morale. The very fact of achievement of status in the collective bargaining process makes the teacher feel important. It gives him the feelings of dignity and self-worth which are the sine qua non of any wholesome interpersonal relations. This is all-important for its carry-over effect in relating to the child in the classroom.

Being part of a broad, socially oriented labor movement helps to make the teacher more sensitive to the needs of society and, more particularly, to those of the children sitting in his classroom. The role of the labor movement is crucial in this connection. Note the statement of President Lyndon Johnson on July 14, 1964, when he signed a bill in regard to problems of the aged:

> The AFL-CIO has done more good for more people than any other group in America in its legislative efforts.
>
> It doesn't just try to do something about wages and hours for its own people. No group in the country works harder in the interests of everyone.
>
> It helps young and old and middle-aged. It's interested in education, in housing, in the poverty program, and does as much good for millions who have never belonged to a union as for its own members.
>
> That is my conception of an organization working in the public interest. I've wanted to say this for a long time because I believe the American people ought to know the remarkable contribution which organized labor makes to the promotion of sound legislation.

Unquestionably, this socially significant role of the AFL-CIO, and the AFT included, leads to a more wholesome life and a greater receptivity to education.

Of great importance, and more specifically related to the subject at hand, are the provisions in the collective bargaining agreements that AFT locals have been able to achieve.

Here, again, some of the results are indirect. The elimination of

non-teaching chores, such as patrols of cafeterias, halls, and toilets, and of a good deal of clerical work, frees the teacher to devote more time to his professional duties and relieves him of avoidable fatigue. The provision of duty-free lunch periods in elementary schools eliminates a denigrating element in the teacher's working day, at the same time, and has a salutary effect upon his physical and emotional condition when dealing with his students in the classroom. The same is true in regard to the initiation of unassigned periods for elementary school teachers, giving them a working condition that has long been prevalent in the secondary schools.

Let me now turn to some of the changes through collective bargaining that have had a more direct effect on the quality of education. In Detroit, the respective rights and duties of both teachers and administrators in regard to the enforcement of discipline, are specifically stipulated. This is a major step in the delineation of responsibilities in an area that has caused great difficulty in staff retention, and one in which teachers have persistently claimed lack of administrator support.

The New York City agreement resulted in the greater use of specialists (e.g., art, music, and health education teachers) in elementary schools. This serves a double purpose: (a) it gives the children the benefit of specially trained people in subject areas in which the average teacher cannot be expected to be adequately competent, and (b) it provides the personnel needed to relieve the regular teachers when they are on their unassigned periods.

Worthy of special mention is the More Effective Schools (MES) program initiated in New York City through the consultative process mentioned previously. This is a comprehensive program, dealing with every aspect of the educational process, and intended primarily to attack the blight in our urban schools, with particular initial attention to the slum and ghetto sections. The plan originated in committee studies in our New York City local on the problems of the difficult schools. After much persistent effort on the part of the local, the then superintendent of schools, convinced of the probable effectiveness of the plan, appointed a committee representing, in equal numbers, the United Federation of Teachers (the duly elected bargaining agent for the teachers), the supervisory organizations, and the superintendent's staff. After an intensive study, which was cut down to a minimum of delay by giving the committee members time off from their regular duties, the union's plan, with some modifications, was adopted as official policy and instituted in a limited number of schools in September 1964. Already, tremendous

successes have been noted, in pupil achievement and attitudes to school, in the teachers' attitude and readiness to accept positions and remain in the "difficult" schools, and in parental attitudes. The emphasis on quality education in the program has, to an appreciable degree, de-emphasized the demands for integration through the process of shifting minority group children to those schools in which there is a white preponderance, and, in fact, has had the reverse effect of white parents sending their children to predominantly Negro schools where the More Effective School program exists.

A look at the future is now in order. There can be no doubt that the role of the teacher in school policy-making will be enhanced in the years ahead. Will this be constructive and beneficial to our schools, or will it be a negative and harmful influence? What, for example, will be the effect of the new employment relations on educational innovations?

To be completely candid, there will often be difficult problems when new content and methodology are proposed to take the place of the old. However, to the degree that this difficulty arises out of inertia, it is no more true of teachers than of administrators. A significant factor in the introduction and success of change processes will be the extent to which organized teachers are included in the discussions of proposed innovations and in their evaluation.

Important, too, is the involvement of teachers' organizations in developing and implementing retraining procedures for innovations in the teaching process.

In some instances, it may be desirable for the teaching staff to oppose or at least to delay the introduction of innovations. Entirely too little is known of the real effectiveness of such devices as new reading techniques, programmed teaching, ungraded classes, team teaching, and so on. Teachers may and should insist on real research before any device is pushed full scale. They will be particularly alert to screen devices that may be primarily geared to economies rather than improvement in teaching. Among these are changes that call for increased class sizes or the use of volunteers and non-professionals as teaching aides.

When one gets into these and other areas of professional activity, such as curriculum, teacher recruitment, and the use of teaching materials, in the early stages of collective bargaining it may be possible only to delineate methods of resolving these problems rather than making substantive decisions. But we can expect the collective bargaining process to include more and more of these "professional" areas.

Conclusion

All in all, the changing patterns in employment relations in public schools are and will be a wholesome influence on the quality of education.

The classroom teacher is being recognized as an essential and constructive factor in the decision-making process. It is he who is in closest touch with the teaching/learning situation, and his experiences and attitudes must be given more and more recognition.

Furthermore, the procedure by which this joint venture in the school enterprise is to be worked out will increasingly take on the form of collective bargaining. In this connection it is becoming increasingly clear that unionism is not only compatible with professionalism, but that it is an essential means of enhancing it.

The American Federation of Teachers sparked the movement for comprehensive collective bargaining contracts. Quality education has been a guiding factor in these negotiations. Where other organizations have followed us and have had successes, we welcome it. But I am convinced that the American Federation of Teachers, because of its ideology as well as its practical approach, is and will remain the best instrument through which our educational objectives can be achieved.

A Change in Employment Relationships in Public Schools — Implications for Quality Education

*Allan M. West**

THE BEST one-word description of the times in which we live is "change." The title you have given me is, therefore, a very timely one. John Gardner in his book entitled *Self Renewal* quoted Nicholas Murray Butler as saying that as Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden, Adam might have remarked to Eve that they were about to enter upon a period of great social change. The world has been experiencing social changes ever since, but never before have changes taken place at such a rapid pace.

We are engaged in a social revolution called urbanization which by 1970 will see three out of four Americans living in about two-hundred centers. The forces which are causing this revolution are having, and will continue to have, profound effect upon the schools and school relationships. So much has been written on this subject that I will not take time to describe the changes which are taking place in our communities which affect schools, but let me mention a few.

The problems of growth of our urban school systems are illustrated by some of the problems which exist in my home city of Washington, D.C. In the last fifteen years the total population of Washington has remained almost static. It has increased only from 802,000 to 808,000. By contrast, the school population has gone up 59 percent — from 93,600 to 148,600. These statistics tell only part of the story. The true problem is not revealed in numbers or pupils alone. The added pupils are bringing to school more individual needs than ever before. Many come from culturally deprived homes. They are insecure. They are unaccustomed to urban living. They have had haphazard, disconnected, and inferior

* Assistant Executive Secretary for Field Operations and Urban Services, National Education Association.

schooling in other parts of the country. Many carry the added handicap of racial discrimination.

The problems of financing schools present new problems as pupils stay in school longer and complete more grades at progressively higher cost. We can expect more competition for the school tax dollar as the demands of higher levels of education clash with the needs for a variety of other public services in our burgeoning urban and suburban communities. While faced with an increased responsibility many school systems are handicapped in their efforts to discharge it by a deterioration of the school tax base and higher costs.

Although Americans have not reached a consensus on the goals of education, the schools are under greater pressure to provide high-quality education than ever before.

Increases in the pupil population in recent years have required the employment of more young teachers. This infusion of youth into the teaching staff is dropping the average age of the instructional staff by about four years per decade. These younger teachers are impatient. They want to receive their share of the fruits of an affluent society. They are better trained than ever before and they want to be treated as professionals. They are impatient with the pace at which school systems are making use of new teaching materials and modern methods. They are impatient with the reluctance of school personnel to discard old habits acquired in a more deliberate period. Because there are more opportunities, the new breed of young teachers is willing to take some risks to make improvements. This new attitude was expressed to me recently by a young teacher in a crisis situation. He said, "I will not continue to teach under present conditions with inadequate supplies, equipment, outworn personnel policies, and inadequate compensation. I am willing to try any possible means to change conditions. If changes are not effected, I will leave the school system and seek other employment."

Changes are also taking place in community attitudes which have significance for schools. More of our citizens are engaged in public employment and fewer in private employment. As a result, new public policies are being developed. Federal Executive Order No. 10988, which grants to employees of the federal government some of the same rights to negotiate with employers that are enjoyed by employees in the private sector, is an example of such a change. There also appears to be a growing public tolerance for militant action by teachers. Some parents are as impatient as the teachers with the pace of change in the public schools. Perhaps the civil rights movement and its obvious rightness have

helped to soften public attitudes toward militant action by other groups. The new importance of education since the first Russian Sputnik may also have contributed to this tolerance. Moreover, much of the militant action thus far has been expressed in the urban communities where the ethnic composition of the city population has shifted the control of city affairs from the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants to a new power structure comprised of Negroes, Jews, and Catholics.

The growth of our urban communities and the consolidation of schools in suburban and rural areas has served to depersonalize the schools. City school systems have always been big. Now there are large systems in suburban and rural areas as well. Many teachers in these large systems feel lost in the machinery of bureaucracy. Communications which once were easy and personal have become formal and impersonal. The impersonal nature of large schools has created human needs among teachers which too often are allowed to remain unmet. Teachers under these conditions often have a feeling of futility about their own ability to effect needed changes.

These are some of the conditions which have led teachers' organizations to propose professional negotiation to their boards of education as a means of giving teachers an orderly procedure through which they may participate in the decision-making process for schools. These are some of the conditions which have led to the adoption of legislation in eight states granting to teachers the legal right and establishing procedures through which to participate in the formulation of school policies.

Let me say at this point that I do not view change with alarm. Change frequently opens doors which lead to other open doors.

I look upon the opportunities of change as Willard Wirtz did in a 1962 speech to the National Press Club entitled "The Future Is a Good Idea." On that occasion he said:

> Change requires constructive, honest, straight-forward, wise answers to the problems it presents. It is not hard to guide the affairs of a going concern along a course of previous conduct or represent other people in their contented enjoyment of things as they are or have been all along. The demand today upon leaders of American labor and industry, upon those of us in public government, and upon the press, is a hard, challenging, tough demand that change be met squarely and that it be made man's servant so it will not become his master.
> If this is a grim prospect for the lazy, the scared, the satisfied, it is an exciting prospect for those who recognize change as the essential

> quality of growth, who see growth as the distinguishing characteristic of life, and who believe strongly that the future is a good idea.[1]

In terms of the problems of employer-employee relations in education, I agree with Dr. H. Thomas James who had this to say to the White House Conference on Education last summer in Washington:

> The teaching profession is now engaged in a nationwide struggle to promote its interests directly with boards of education, thus removing the need for reliance on intervention by any level of the administrative line. This struggle has been viewed with some alarm by those who would label it a dangerous intrusion of labor-management concepts into a professional realm. My own conclusion is that it is no such thing, but is rather a struggle by professionals to achieve the right, rather generally accepted in western civilization, to be governed by written rules developed with their involvement and consent and not by the caprices of men. American schools are still among the most authoritarian institutions in our society, and the revolution now in progress may be needed as badly as was the elimination of partisan politics from the teacher recruitment processes after the turn of this century. The substitution of written law and due process for the ubiquitous influence peddler has always been viewed as progress after its accomplishment. It may in this instance have, in addition to other salutary effects on the educational system, the added advantages of reducing the attractiveness of school administration for the authoritarian personality. The legitimate functions of the school administrator should be easier to perform after the new agreements are drawn, and the great majority of able and qualified professional school administrators will welcome the change.[2]

Whether the movement to formalized agreements is bad (as some fear) or good (as Dr. James and I assert) depends upon how they are used. I am optimistic. I have confidence in our ability to improve upon anything that is yet known in this field. It is far too early to be dogmatic. One thing we should understand is that we can adopt formal procedures which will either move education forward or backward. The choice to do nothing is no longer available. The decision has been made and there will be no turning back. Our challenge, it seems to me, is to take the offensive with change and, with the use of our imagination and ingenuity, develop procedures which make use of experience but recognize

---

[1] Willard E. Wirtz, *Labor and the Public Interest* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 16–17.

[2] H. Thomas James, "Can Urban Schools Be Managed?" Consultants' Papers, The White House Conference on Education, July 20–21, 1965, p. 156.

the unique nature of public employment and the special relationships which exist in the schools.

We should also recognize that, at best, we are only dealing with part of a larger process for achieving better schools and better working conditions for teachers. The needs of the schools cannot be met fully in the local community. An important part of what happens in the community is being decided somewhere else. To be effective, professional negotiation must be accompanied by the ability to pass tax and bond issue proposals, and influence the state legislature and the Congress. Therefore, the procedures we use locally must not destroy the cooperative relationships necessary to progress at the state and national levels.

Nevertheless, changing conditions have placed new responsibilities upon local teacher groups and some have been slow to respond. At the present time, local teacher organizations are, generally speaking, the least able to fulfill their responsibilities. For this reason we can expect a continuation and acceleration of the movement toward more formalized procedures governing teacher-school board relationships. We can also expect some conflicts to develop until we learn to work together in the new relationship.

No one has a greater stake in the development of effective procedures than the superintendent of schools. Of all the sources in the community which can be counted on consistently to support leadership for better schools, the professional staff is the most faithful. No one is in a better position to correct the conditions which are setting the stage for conflict than the school superintendent. He has it in his power to see that adequate grievance procedures are provided to give easy access to teachers for the solution of day-to-day problems which develop in the individual schools. He can provide opportunity for participation in policy-making. He can initiate leadership training programs aimed at elimination of paternalistic attitudes among the administrative staff. My experience tells me that people react largely in terms of the way in which they are treated. If they are treated as professionals, they are likely to respond as professionals. If they are treated as menial hired hands, they are likely to respond in kind. The school superintendent can do much to show respect for teachers and the teaching process by providing the conditions under which the teacher is the unquestioned manager in his own classroom. He will have more satisfied teachers if he recognizes that creative teaching flourishes with freedom, security, and respect, and that it is inhibited by oversupervision, overregulation, and regimentation.

The decision has been made that formalized procedures are needed to

provide an orderly means of bilateral decision-making for education. There is less agreement concerning the machinery. The teachers' union is attempting to transfer procedures developed in the industrial segment to education, with all the trappings and precedents which have been developed in industry since the passage of the Wagner Act. On the other hand, professional associations are attempting to learn what they can from the experience in the industrial area, but recognizing that modification must be made to relate the process to the public school setting.

Let me point out what I consider to be some of the major areas of agreement and disagreement between the approaches of the teachers' union and the professional organization. Both agree that formalized procedures are necessary. Both subscribe to the principle of exclusive representation. Both organizations agree that there must be some established rules by which negotiations shall take place.

Some of the chief differences between the approaches of the two organizations lie in the composition of the negotiating unit, the scope of the subject matter of negotiation, and the channels through which negotiation shall take place.

Professional organizations believe that an arbitrary standard of uniformity in the composition of the negotiating unit does not make sense. We believe in local option. The decision concerning the composition of the negotiating unit should be made at the local level. In Connecticut, for example, if there is a question concerning the composition of a unit, a referendum is held to determine whether the unit shall be restricted to classroom teachers only, or whether it shall include all members of the instructional staff with the exception of the superintendent of schools. This decision should be made on the basis of local climate, traditions, and the effectiveness of past cooperation among school staff members. In school systems with a long tradition of effective cooperation on the part of all members of the professional staff, an all-inclusive negotiating unit can give great strength to the negotiating process. On the other hand, if there is a tradition of conflict among teachers and administrators or if teachers do not feel free to express their views in an all-inclusive unit, the unit should be restricted. The Taylor Committee appointed by Governor Rockefeller to recommend needed amendments to the Condon-Wadlin Act took a pragmatic view of the composition of the negotiating unit. It recognized that procedures which are working effectively should not be disturbed. It also recommended diversity as a means of improving the process through experience with a variety of different approaches.

The experience of the National Union of Teachers in Great Britain, the Canadian Federation of Teachers, and of some unions such as the typographical workers within the labor organizations themselves has demonstrated that negotiating units which include supervisors can be effective. My experience with teacher organizations is that some of the most effective leaders and some of the most militant leaders will be found among the principals.

A second difference between procedures recommended by the professional organizations and the teachers' union has to do with the subject matter of negotiation. We believe that negotiations should go beyond the narrow limits of labor precedents. I believe that there should be continuous ongoing joint studies by the board of education and teachers' organizations so that there will always be some items on the "back of the stove" which will provide data for the enlightenment of future negotiating sessions. The legitimate areas for negotiation should be defined and agreed upon in the basic document which establishes the agreement by which bilateral decision-making shall take place.

It is the belief of professional organizations that all matters having a bearing on quality education should be legitimate matters for bilateral decisions.

Professional organizations believe in the use of educational channels for fact-finding or appeal in cases of persistent disagreement between boards of education and teachers' organizations. This springs from the belief of professional organizations in the broadened scope of the subject matter of negotiation. If teachers and boards of education are to discuss matters which affect the quality of the school program, persons with some background in educational research and the learning process should be available to assist in resolving persistent disagreements between the board of education and the association. Traditional labor channels may put the resolution of the dispute ahead of the educational rightness of the decision. It is important that disputes be settled, but it is more important when dealing with school policies that they be settled right.

The Effects of Collective Action upon Quality Education

Teacher Morale

I believe sincerely that the quality of education can be improved by giving teachers a greater voice in its formulation. I have confidence in teachers. I believe strongly that teachers who are worthy to teach are

also worthy to assist in making the policies which shall govern that teaching. Moreover, I believe that teachers who are given a share in the decision-making process will be better teachers. Rensis Lickert in his *New Patterns of Management* quotes a worker as responding to an opinion question in the following language: "The only reason I work is to make money; no other reason. Some guys (damn few) say they work for pleasure. They must be bats. How the hell am I supposed to get satisfaction from my job? I'd just as soon dig post holes. At least I'd be in the fresh air."

Compare this comment with the following response to a similar question taken from an opinion poll conducted by one of our affiliated professional organizations: "It gives me a feeling of great accomplishment to work with children. I feel that I am educating myself and doing something that is socially significant at the same time."

I am sure that the attitudes of these two persons would have a profound bearing on the quality of their service.

Francis S. Chase, former chairman of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Chicago, made a study of teacher morale in over two hundred school systems in forty-three states. He sought to determine what administrative policies and practices tend to increase the satisfaction which teachers experience in their work. From 1,784 replies from teachers he generalized as follows:

> One of the most important contributions to the satisfaction which teachers take in their work and the enthusiasm which they feel for the system in which they are working is a sense of professional status, responsibility, and freedom. Freedom to plan one's own work was rated as the most important potential source of satisfaction by all groups of respondents. It was given the highest possible rating for satisfaction by 77 per cent of the teachers in the elementary schools, 75 per cent of those in secondary schools, 69 per cent of the men teachers, 78 per cent of the women teachers, over 80 per cent of the superior teachers, and nearly 69 per cent of the below-average teachers.
>
> The interviews supplied further evidence of the importance of this factor. Again and again teachers who were enthusiastic about the system in which they were working praised their freedom to experiment, to adapt programs to the needs of their pupils; or cited as important to satisfaction the fact that they were regarded as competent to make their own decisions and to work out their own procedures.

> Freedom to plan one's own work is given the highest possible rating by more than three fourths of all respondents, and achieves a considerably higher average rating than any other factor.[2]

Satisfying participation can be a factor in raising the quality of education. Professional negotiation provides such opportunities for participation for teachers through the teachers' own organization.

Professional Teamwork

The teacher is the most important but not the only element in achieving quality education. Quality education requires cooperation among all professional personnel. Important as the teacher is, he cannot produce quality education by his own efforts.

Studies by Mort and others have revealed that one of the greatest factors in producing quality in education is the number of professionals per one hundred pupils employed by a school system. Therefore, any procedure which recognizes this principle will seek to promote a teamwork philosophy which emphasizes unity rather than conflict among the school staff members. The arbitrary division of teachers and administrator is divisive. Recognizing the realities of some situations, I know that it will not always be possible to include all professionals in the negotiating unit. However, when tradition and the climate of a school system permit the formation of an effective all-inclusive unit for negotiation purposes, I believe that quality education is most likely to exist.

Professional Negotiation and Inovation

While I cannot point to any specific results, I believe that professional negotiations can be means of introducing innovations in the school system. I believe that the teaching profession is now challenged to use professional negotiation as a means of improving education. I believe that the teacher, if he is going to continue to improve his status, must do so by improving education while pressing for improved conditions and status for himself. The professional organizations are in the best position to provide educational improvement. This past year the National Education Association received several millions of dollars in grants from private foundations and the federal government for the support of a variety of projects aimed at the improvement of education. These grants were given by the donors with the belief that if teachers participate in

---

[2] Francis S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1951, p. 130.

programs designed to improve education through their own organizations the findings of these programs are more likely than not to be implemented in the classroom. Furthermore, the length of time between the research and implementation may be shortened. NEA has over thirty departments, each concerned with improving the quality of education in its own field. I see in the professional negotiation process great promise for implementing the results of studies of these departments and special projects fostered by the professional organizations.

Some criticism has been directed toward negotiating on the ground that most of the effort seems directed toward improving the economic position of the teachers. The assumption is that improving the position of the teachers has no relationship to the excellence of education. Research reveals that this assumption is false. Studies by Benjamin Bloom have shown that there is a direct relationship between expenditures for education and excellence. If our efforts to involve teachers in bilateral decision-making can improve the financing of education, it can provide a strong influence for the improvement of education generally. The freedom enjoyed by professional organizations puts them in a position to provide needed financing better than any other organization.

Teachers of America have made the choice that they wish to formalize a procedure whereby they may participate in a more responsible and satisfying way in the establishment of school policies which affect them. We are now in a position to develop such machinery in the right and appropriate way or to adopt machinery which does not fit the school enterprise. The choice to do nothing is lost forever. The real task before us is to develop an innovative process which draws upon the experience of the past (including that in the industrial segment) but frees us from the precedents, institutional loyalties, and stereotypes of industry. We have a real opportunity to become pioneers in an exciting adventure if we have the courage, foresight, judgment, and patience to adjust to new conditions while retaining our common purposes: to improve education and advance the teaching profession. We now face a period of great change, but with Secretary Wirtz I see this period as providing opportunities for us if we see it as though we were "standing always as at the dawn, aware of what the day offers, and ready to seize its fullest promise."

The Influence of Teacher Collective Bargaining on the Quality of Education: Observations of a Board Negotiator

*Morris E. Lasker**

THE AMERICAN system of public education is predicated on the assumption of responsible discharge by the parties involved — boards of education, administrators, teachers, and taxpayers — of their obligations to the children of America.

Classically the authority (as distinct from the skill and inspiration) to carry out this assignment has rested primarily with boards and administrators, on the one hand, and taxpayers, on the other. But in recent years the aspirations of teachers, supported in many places by public opinion and recognized in many by public authority — whether it be the President of the United States, state legislatures, or municipal executives — have brought about a new equation in which power is diffused or diffusing between boards and teachers — in most cases responsibly supported by taxpayers. The usual form of this diffusion is a process of negotiation by representatives of the teachers with the board. Sometimes the process is called professional negotiations, sometimes collective negotiations, sometimes collective bargaining, but it is always the same baby, whatever the bath water. Where such diffusion exists, whether by permission of boards or mandates to them, the process has been authorized because of the explicit or implicit decision that such an

---

* Counsel, New Rochelle and Patchogue, New York, School Boards.

Note: These remarks do not deal with the question of whether collective bargaining is advantageous or disadvantageous for any particular district. I have dealt with that subject elsewhere — that is, the reasons for and against adopting the collective bargaining procedure within a particular district. The question here is what, assuming the collective bargaining process has already been adopted, will be the effects on the quality of education within such district; and whether, under such circumstances, the results may be expected to be favorable, acceptable, or adverse.

arrangement will produce a *better* school system than would otherwise be the case. Since the assignment of the American public education system is to produce as high quality an education as is consistent with available resources, the "better system" intended to be produced by collective bargaining should, if the assumptions are correct, be reflected in the quality of education.

The purpose of these remarks is to explore whether experience indicates that collective bargaining does or is likely *in fact* to produce better education. It should be noted that "quality of education" is always the result of a process consisting of decisions as to (1) the content of the curriculum, (2) the establishment of a mechanical structure capable of teaching the curriculum effectively, and finally, (3) the actual teaching procedure itself.

It is important to realize that the elements of this process will be determined somehow in any event. The effect of collective bargaining is not to eliminate the need for such decisions or alter the determinations to be made, but formally to admit a new party to the making of the decisions themselves. And the word "formally" is important because it goes without saying that by plan, or merely by osmosis in some cases, intelligent boards and administrators have long since *informally* admitted teachers to this sanctum of decision.

Before giving philosophical consideration to adverse or favorable effects of collective bargaining on the quality of education, we should consider specifically the categories of actual demands pressed by teachers' groups in representative negotiations to date. The demands which are discussed below reflect material contained in contracts in New York City and contracts or demands pressed in the Metropolitan area of New York.

An analysis of the categories of demands, it seems to me, establishes that no single category interferes with the quality of education per se, and most, if not all, if grantable and granted, would indeed improve quality. In reviewing the categories of demands, however, it is important to observe that demands may interfere with the quality of education if the emphasis on a particular demand is pressed to the exclusion of other items important and necessary in the educational program. With these minor observations, let's take a look at the record. Teachers' contract proposals or demands generally fall into the following categories (not necessarily in order of importance):

(a) Salaries

(b) Credit for further education

(c) Class size

(d) Relief from non-teaching chores (teacher aides for lunch room, hall duty, yard duty, etc.)

(e) Grievance procedures and arbitration (and in case of Association affiliates, procedure for negotiation impasses)

(f) Working load

(g) Special teachers (psychiatric social workers, psychologists, art, music, reading, etc.)

(h) Teacher assistants and practice teachers

(i) Teacher facilities

(j) Assignment of teachers within their fields

(k) Limitations on or priority in relation to transfer of teachers between schools or between grades

(l) Procedure for evaluation of teachers — with special emphasis on evaluation of probationary teachers

(m) Protection of teachers in assault cases, etc.

(n) Leave and compensation for lost time

(o) Procedures for application for, and filling of, vacancies

(p) Right to review own files

(q) Right to use non-school time after discharge of duties

(r) Use of bulletin boards and mail boxes

(s) Check-off of Association or union dues, as the case may be

(t) Regular consultations with principals and superintendents

(u) Participation in development of curriculum (and time and pay therefor)

(v) Preparation periods

(w) Limitations on administrative approval of courses taken for credit

I would not for a moment say that any of the above demands pressed to an absurd extreme cannot have an adverse effect on the system — good objectives pressed to an extreme can sometimes have as harmful a result as bad objectives. Putting aside the extremes, however, I think we can agree that most of the demands listed above are objectives which administrators and boards *share* with teachers. For example, boards and administrators do not argue that good salaries, or credits for further education, or limitations on class size, or limitations on working

load, or adequate staffs of special teachers, or decent evaluation procedures are not desirable objectives. The argument, when it comes, has to do with whether the objectives are financially feasible within the budget — that is, a question of choices among available possibilities; and the argument as to conditions of work for teachers (as distinct from purely budgetary items) has to do, not with whether teachers should be given the dignity of professionals, but as to what constitutes doing a professional job.

You will recall that Dr. Conant's report on the American high school included recommendations on such items as class size, ability groupings, admission to advance placement, and the like. I see no reason for us to be disappointed if teachers' demands in collective bargaining reflect serious interest in the very same questions. But we must not be simplistic in our approach to the subject. While I stress that individual demands, if feasible and granted, may generally contribute to the quality of education, nevertheless there are certain general reservations which must be made.

Viewed at the philosophic level, one must agree that collective bargaining has in it the *potential* for some adverse effects as well as the potential for good. Let us review these effects. The possibly adverse include:

(a) An emphasis on *teacher* benefits over student welfare. That is, where money is short, should salaries be raised at the expense, for example, of adequate services for emotionally disturbed children, curriculum development, integration program, etc., etc.? Or, to take another example, what of the reduction in or refusal to perform extracurricular activities?

(b) "Political distortion." Any teacher organization is by definition a political organism. Demands may often be made and pressed, or grievances be put forward and processed, for political reasons — that is, to pacify special or general teacher pressure groups, and not necessarily for reasons consistent with the welfare of the district as a whole. In this respect, however, one could observe that democracy is "politically distorted," but most of us feel that the distortion is more than compensated for by the gains.

(c) A further result of the politics of militant teacher action may be the substitution of the political teacher for the master teacher as the key professional in the dynamics of a school or district.

(d) A result most serious and adverse if it comes about — but in my opinion not at all inevitable and clearly within the power of a board of

education to prevent — would be the possible eclipse of the administrator, and, more particularly, the principals, if bargaining is carried out by teacher representatives and boards of education over the heads of the administrators.

(e) Some people might include strikes as a possibly adverse result of collective bargaining. I do not. Not because I do not believe that strikes in the public schools are a bad thing, but because I do not believe that they result from the collective bargaining process. In the light of my experience, I believe that strikes are a result of pressure which would bring them about whether or not collective bargaining is a part of the picture. In fact, such collective arrangements may, and it is hoped often will, reduce the pressure for strikes.

The favorable effects are:

1. *The improvement in teacher morale.*

(a) There is no doubt that for the average teacher the institution of collective negotiations or bargaining between teachers' representatives and boards of education increases his personal feeling of security, both financial and otherwise.

(b) In addition, it seems to me that the morale of the average teacher is also enhanced by the satisfaction and dignity resulting from the formal admission of him or his representatives to the "sanctum of decision."

(c) Finally, the teacher's morale is stimulated by the knowledge that his professional aspirations and grievances and those of his colleagues will be given serious and formal consideration at the highest level.

2. *The introduction of creative educational ideas.*

The solicitation and consideration of ideas which is necessarily a part of the collective bargaining process — that is, solicitation of teachers' ideas by their representatives for presentation to the board — undoubtedly stimulate additional and deeper thinking by the teachers than would be the case in an informal or formless structure.

Nor is this restricted to teachers. Administrators and boards are not only presented with creative possibilities which even they may not previously have considered, but they will broaden their own views by analyzing the worth of the teachers' proposals. Whatever the result, the process itself is creative.

3. *Consideration of the needs of the district as a whole.*

The requirement that teachers through their representatives must, if they share power, share responsibility for making choices, imposes on

the teachers and their representatives the necessity of considering the needs of the district as a whole. Collective bargaining should and, in my opinion, does force the parties to articulate a scale of values if for no other reason than that the demands put forward almost inevitably exceed the resources available. The creation of such a scale of values is a maturing experience for those involved.

4. *A unified stance in relation to the public.*

It seems to me that one of the clear advantages of collective bargaining is that, once agreement is reached between the teachers and the board, a unified stance can be taken in relation to the public. If one accepts, as I do, the view expressed by Myron Lieberman that the educational profession must itself provide the leadership for the improvement of educational standards, and that this is not "up to the public" any more than it is in the fields of medicine, law, or university teaching, for example, then one finds satisfaction in the fact that — through harmonious collective bargaining — boards, administrators, and teachers can together provide such leadership.

Conclusion

Like all human institutions, collective bargaining, whether in public education or elsewhere, is a tool that may be productively or destructively used. If the assumption on which the American system of public education is predicated — that is, that those responsible will discharge their obligations to the children of America — is sound, the results of collective bargaining within public education will be good. I believe American experience has proved that this assumption is valid and that collective bargaining in the schools, responsibly exercised, will be a force for the improvement of the quality of education.

Major Themes: Points of Agreement and Disagreement

*Joan R. Egner**

EACH paper presented a major theme. It appears appropriate to review these major themes briefly in order to look for areas of agreement and disagreement in the consultants' orientation to the problem.

Benson argued that our public system of education must strive toward two objectives if it is to be dominant in providing educational services. One objective is reduction of inequalities of staff, materials, and physical facilities among school districts and within large city school systems. Related to this objective is the problem of differences in allocation of resources for liberal v. technical curricula. Reduction of inequities through effects of collective negotiations was viewed by Benson as limited at the local level, though possible at the state level, but conditional at both levels because of lack of votes controlled by the educational establishment. It is intriguing to note that Benson saw collective negotiation having possible immediate impact on curriculum control in the secondary school. He maintained that bilateral participation in educational policy decisions carried out by teacher groups with strong union ties could lead to changing attitudes toward curriculum content and organization. Benson's second objective for public education was a criterion of efficiency. He saw the quest for cost-effectiveness techniques as an aid to decisions of resource allocation.

Cogan developed two themes: (1) the AFT is committed to the principles and goals of trade unionism, and (2) the AFT recognizes conflict of interest between teachers and administrators. Affiliation with the AFL-CIO, according to Cogan, places the teacher with the labor movement in its historic search for the improvement of social conditions. This search for social improvement utilizes tactics of collective negotia-

* Assistant Professor, School of Education, Cornell University.

tions and a militant stance including publicity, picketing, rallies, and the strike. He sees the relationship between teachers and the union philosophy as one of improving the quality of education. Cogan's theme of conflict between teachers and administrators was so delineated that conflict was not necessarily dysfunctional. He presented evidence to show that conflict increased professionalization of teachers and that unionism and militancy were positively correlated with professionalism. In short, Cogan sees collective bargaining as a process by which conflict can be resolved.

West focused on changed characteristics of teachers and teacher organizations and the resultant need for new procedures in problem-solving. He maintained that teachers' attitudes have changed and that there is now less risk in being militant. The teacher of today has made the choice to participate in decision-making. West expressed concern that the teachers' desire to participate would be legitimized through machinery of public employee labor acts. A consistent theme throughout West's paper was the call for use of educational channels, rather than labor, to develop procedures necessary to include teachers in decision-making.

Lasker's theme was that of the changing authority relations in public education. He maintained that formerly school boards, administrators, and taxpayers constituted the power base for decision-making. This power base is now diffusing and the process of diffusion is called collective negotiations. Key point of Lasker's statement is that a new party, the teacher, has been formally admitted to the decision-making realm. He argued that the goals of the teacher group are shared by the administrator and school board and that in and of themselves these desires present no conflict. He cautioned however, that the priorities of these demands and the extent to which each party presses for his demand could have adverse effects on the quality of education.

The consultants' papers bring one point of agreement into sharp focus: new employment relationships are a fact whether they are called professional negotiations or collective negotiations. Key component of the relationship is the role of the teacher in bilateral decision-making. Each speaker alluded to the favorable effects of the changing employment relationship, and cited better teacher morale and an increase in the status of the teacher. Participation by the teacher in educational decision-making was viewed as an aid to the introduction of innovation, both in rate and quantity.

Benson and Cogan held that the union could influence curriculum

design and content within a school. As teachers are active in educational policy decisions their influence can be directly expressed in broad curricular issues. Benson, Cogan, and Lasker took the position that shared responsibility for making decisions would enable the teacher to be more sensitive to the needs of society and to the children in his classroom.

Though reacting from different value positions, Lasker and West agreed that negotiations can be an aid to presenting a unified position of teachers and administrators. They cited the mutual dependency of educators and the need to work together as a team.

As might be expected, West and Cogan revealed more points of disagreement than did other consultants. Cogan cited the values for teachers in associating with a trade union, while West expressed trepidation for teachers being part of public employee legislation. Differences in composition of the bargaining units were expressed, but West did not appear to be as stringent in his position for an all-inclusive unit as Cogan was for the exclusive unit. It seemed that West was calling for a unit composition decision to be made at the local level with consideration of the traditions and values of the particular community.

Conflict between teacher-administrator and teacher-school board was discussed in two ways. Cogan would use the conflict to advance the cause of teacher unions. West's attitude was to mute conflict and work to present a united front to the public. Lasker minimized the existence of conflict by emphasizing the shared demands and concerns of all parties.

Each consultant maintained that innovation would be stimulated by the changing employment relationship, but Cogan and West took differing positions as to how this would be effected. Cogan appeared to perceive the teacher as a gate keeper and controller of the rate of innovation at the local level. He seemed to portray the teacher as a cautious questioner and somewhat of a doubter of the value of new educational practices. West's position looked to the professional association for research and development of educational innovation with dissemination to the local level through organization channels. Benson's approach to innovation was, like Cogan's, operative at the local level. Yet, Benson saw the teacher as an initiator in the classroom — an initiator of new approaches to teaching and fresh ways of looking at the curriculum.

Cogan placed his faith in teacher-union alignment to solve education problems. Benson's view was not so sanguine. He discerned the possibility of AFT influence but little probability until union membership reaches sufficient size to control votes. The four consultants' papers appeared to

be in agreement as to the ultimate goal of bilateral decision-making but what organizational ties teachers would best use to achieve this goal is still very much a question.

Questions for Further Study

*William T. Lowe**

LIVELY and provocative discussion followed each of the presentations. These were not question-and-answer sessions, nor were they tell-me-what-you-do-in-Oshkosh affairs. These were truly discussions. The participants wanted to know, and it was obvious that they realized that the topic had enormous significance for them.

It seemed also that these school leaders generally regret the direction and the speed of some of the changes which are occurring in teacher-administrator-school board relations. This attitude did not lead to a verbalized desire to return to "the good old days." Rather, they seemed to agree that, like it or not, rapid change in this area is inevitable, that the directions are already determined, and that there is no choice but to accept the challenge of trying to harness these forces for the improvement of public education.

It seems appropriate to close this publication with their persistent questions. These questions serve as a kind of summary, but more important, they demand attention.

1. If we assume more active and more formal teacher involvement in school policy matters than has previously existed, then traditional roles for all parties concerned will necessarily shift. The crucial question is: What will be and what should be the functions, status, and roles of those concerned with public education: building principals, chief school officers, special service personnel, supervisors, department heads, the teacher who becomes the negotiator, the teacher who isn't a member of the collective bargaining organization, the board member, the teacher-educator from the college, the state education department member, the legislator, U.S.O.E. staff, and the like? Will there really be an "eclipse of

* Associate Professor, School of Education, Cornell University.

the principal"? If so, is this necessarily a bad thing particularly in view of contemporary movement toward teaching specializations? Is the chief school officer going to become a "representative of management" only? (Is he already this without knowing it?) What will (should) the supervisor become: an agent of the board or an agent of the teachers' association? Can he be both?

Who should participate in the association is, of course, related to the role question. Do we need men and women who can play new roles? What of Mr. Lasker's intriguing dichotomy, "master teacher" and "political teacher?" Might these types become real?

In short, the fundamental sociological questions — who does what and who is expected to do what in public schools — must be carefully re-examined in view of the trends in collective negotiations.

2. All the consultants seemed to agree that teachers are going to become far more militant, more action-oriented, more "virile" professionals. Further, they all thought this a good thing and long overdue. However, the schoolmen present were anxious to establish that some teachers in some school districts have been significantly involved in policy decisions for a long, long time. They wanted to make it perfectly clear that procedures and processes have existed for encouraging teachers to interact with boards of education on instructional and welfare matters. They insisted that the significant questions are: How can we capitalize on the strengths of existing processes and not have them washed away in a tide of change for change's sake? How can we dispel the notion that all teachers have been milktoasts? In communities where we already have strong professionals, how can we insure that collective bargaining activities are not going to affect the existing strengths adversely. In fact, in all communities, how can we guard against having group activities rob teachers of their essential independence and autonomy? Do we need a formal collective bargaining arrangement in all communities? Does the collective bargaining process where it exists necessarily have to be tied to either the NEA or the AFL-CIO? This group of questions seemed to focus on two basic themes. How can we save what is worth saving in existing personnel relations, and how much organizational flexibility can we have from community to community?

3. A third area which was discussed but certainly not resolved is the complex matter of work stoppages. Some of the questions which follow were suggested by our consultants, but others weren't mentioned until the discussion periods.

Are strikes and the threat of strikes, or work stoppages by whatever

name, good for public education? bad? both? neither? Is this the same problem that exists in all fields of public employment, or are there special complications for schools? If so, what are they? Can collective negotiations work without strikes or the threat of them? Is Lasker correct when he says that strikes are a bad thing in public schools, but they are not the result of the collective bargaining process; in fact, that this process may reduce the likelihood for strikes? Or are they a necessary evil resulting from collective activity? What are the implications for pupils and others that result from illegal strikes? Assuming that teachers should and do have the right to strike and that they exercise this right, what is to be done with the children while the strike is in progress?

4. What is the relationship between innovation in the schools and changing personnel relationships? Can the institutionalizing of a more formalized procedure for making decisions really help to facilitate the introduction of needed changes, or is this hope a contradiction of "sociological law," e.g., formalization begets rigidity? Our consultants were pointedly asked for evidence to support their assertion that teachers once they were organized and powerful would be agents of change, but they were unable, in our view, to deal with the point adequately. Some of the superintendents clearly thought that teachers might not be. Will they be?

5. What effect on the public will open discussion of controversy and conflict on school matters have? Will highly detrimental cleavages result, or will people just become more informed and more insistent on obtaining the best schools possible? Will citizens try to get involved in school affairs to the point where they will wish to make professional decisions that they are incompetent to make, or will they become increasingly able to appreciate the value of professional expertise?

Who of these citizens who senses what bargaining is like will be willing to serve on school boards? Will a different type of man run for the school board? One seriously wonders if the well-meaning, dedicated, upper-middleclass "do-gooder" who now serves on many school boards will be willing to face a tough-minded professional negotiator and his lawyer and his publicity man. So what if he won't? In sum these questions ask: As teachers become activists, will we lose the support of people we need?

6. Is it a good thing for public education to have rival associations vying for the support and membership of teachers? Will this competition lead to excesses or to the stimulation of healthy self-evaluation?

7. Should teachers' associations be affiliated with other groups to get a solid base of power, or should they be "flexibly independent"? If they should affiliate, with whom should they unite? organized labor? public employees? parents' associations of school-age children? other groups of men and women who are required to obtain many years of college training? others? What should the nature and extent of the union be? This question has been with us a long, long time, but it still remains unanswered for many.

8. Will teachers once they have power be interested in the "big picture," or will they become selfishly provincial? That is, will they work for local improvements even if these improvements are at the expense of less well-endowed neighboring communities? Closely related is the question of whether or not welfare matters will receive an inappropriate amount of attention at the expense of other important items, particularly those which will be a drain on resources.

Then, too, is Mr. Benson's intriguing idea that powerful teachers' groups will become a major force in working toward the revitalization of our central cities correct? There have been other groups of working men with great power in our urban centers for years. What have they done to reverse the trend toward decay? Perhaps a great deal, but they have utterly failed. Furthermore, teachers have traditionally been very timid politically. Many of them — perhaps most of them — still, in spite of all the efforts of their associations, question the suitability of having "true professionals engage in dirty politics." Will teachers' associations work toward total revitalization of central cities or, if they work at all, will they work for schools at the expense of other agencies depending on public support?

These are the questions which concerned our participants, and they concern us.